

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-26 were pending. Claims 9-16 were allowed. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 were rejected. In this response, claims 1, 3, 7-8, 17, and 25-26 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-8 and 17-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al., U.S. Patent No. 2002/0069295 ("Edwards") and Eichstaedt et al., U.S. Patent No. 2002/00169725 ("Eichstaedt"). Applicant hereby reserves the right to swear behind the above cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-26 as amended include limitations that are not disclosed by the cited references. Specifically, independent claim 1 requires extracting link information and/or ISO symbol information into a separate output file, which is used to generate a separate display layer. The separate display layer can be displayed in addition to the RFQ file, which includes a raster image of an original electronic file. As a result, when an activation (e.g., a click) is received from the RFQ file displayed, the information (e.g., a Web page from the URL link or the ISO symbol) is displayed in addition to the raster image. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from the cited references, individually or in combination.

Rather, Edwards is related to converting a file to be delivered over a network (see Abstract and Summary of Edwards). Edwards fails to disclose extracting link information and/or ISO symbol to generate a separate display layer that can be displayed in addition to the RFQ file,

where the linked information can be displayed in response to activation from the RFQ file, which contains the raster image of the original electronic file.

Eichstaedt is related to a system for fluid processing plants. It is respectfully submitted that Eichstaedt was filed after the filing date of the present application. Although Eichstaedt claims the benefit of several provisional applications, only the disclosure of the provisional applications can be used to against the present application. Even if Eichstaedt is considered, Eichstaedt still fails to disclose the limitations set forth above.

In addition, there is no suggestion within the Edwards and Eichstaedt to combine with each other. Even if they were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is patentable over Edwards and Eichstaedt.

Similarly, independent claims 7-8, 17, and 25-26 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, independent claims 7-8, 17, and 25-26 are patentable over the cited references.

Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: May 31, 2005


Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095
Kevin_Shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300